

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 8-9, 30-35 and 37-38 are now pending, with Claims 1 and 30 being independent claims. Claims 7 and 36 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 30 have been amended. Support for these claim amendments can be found at least in Claims 7 and 36 as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Claims 10-29 remain withdrawn.

A Request for Continued Examination has been filed simultaneously herewith.

Turning now to the Final Office Action mailed on February 5, 2009:

Regarding the sole rejection under Section 102(b) over Bahar et al., Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants submit that Bahar et al. does not disclose a composition wherein an acid component is present in said composition in a range of from about 5 weight percent to about 90 weight percent based on the total weight of said composition, as now recited in each of independent Claims 1 and 30.

It is stated in the Final Office Action that Bahar et al. discloses, at paragraph 42 of that reference, a polymer porosity of between 40 and 95%, preferably 70%, and since the pores are filled with an acid component, this would read on the claims amount of acid component.

However, Bahar et al. discloses a polymer film or sheet having a polymer porosity, and further discloses that the pores of such film or sheet are filled with a solid polymer electrolyte. The solid polymer electrolyte may take various forms including a polymer composition containing a metal salt as disclosed in Bahar et al. at paragraphs 58 and 59, as also noted in the Final Office Action.

It does not necessarily follow that a polymer film/sheet, having a porosity of 40 and 95%, preferably 70%, which is volume-based, would equate to the same weight percentage range (or even the weight percentage range now recited in Claims 1 and 30) for the metal

salt contained within a solid polymer electrolyte within the pores of this polymer film/sheet, relative to the polymer film/sheet and/or the solid polymer electrolyte.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Bahar et al. does not disclose sufficient information, such as mass or density, of the polymer film/sheets and the polymer component of the solid polymer electrolyte compositions, and does not disclose the amounts of metal salt in the polymer electrolyte compositions, to allow one of ordinary skill to calculate the weight percentage of the metal salt in the polymer composition, based on either the solid polymer electrolyte composition and/or the polymer film/sheet.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Bahar et al. does not anticipate Claims 1 and 30. The same reasoning applies with respect to the Claims 2-6 and 8-9, which depend from Claim 1, and Claims 31-35 and 37-38, which depend from Claim 30.

Therefore, withdrawal of the sole Section 102(b) rejection over Bahar et al. is respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that the foregoing is fully responsive to each of the points raised in the Final Office Action.

A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Applicants' undersigned may be reached at the below-listed numbers, should there be any questions in connection with this case.

Respectfully submitted,



J. Kenneth Joung  
Reg. No. 41,881  
Attorney for Applicants  
(847) 391-2004 (phone)  
(847) 391-2387 (fax)